

A
SECOND APPENDIX

TO A SERMON

PREACHED BEFORE AN

ASSEMBLY

OF

PROTESTANT DISSENTING MINISTERS

IN EXETER:

Occasioned by the Rev. WILLIAM LAMPORT'S Sermons on
preaching Christ crucified, and addressed to the Ministers,
before whom he preached the Substance of them.

By JOSEPH BRET LAND.

Δια δυσφημίας και ευφημίας.

PAUL.

EXETER:

Printed for the Author; sold by J. JOHNSON, No. 72, in St.
Paul's Church-yard, London, and R. TREWMAN and the
AUTHOR, in Exeter. M.DCC.LXXXVII.

[Price SIX PENCE.]

TO THE
PROTESTANT DISSENTING MINISTERS,

BEFORE WHOM

Mr. WILLIAM LAMPORT preached at *Exeter*,

SEPTEMBER 6th, 1786.

GENTLEMEN,

WITHIN eight and forty hours after the delivery of the sermon, preached before the Assembly May 10th, 1786, and since published, I was informed, that it had not met with the cordial approbation of all my brethren. The leading object of it did not seem to be liked by all, and my arguments were esteemed by some inconclusive. Having heard on what grounds my reasoning was objected to, I resolved to draw up an appendix still farther to enforce the duty, which I had insisted on in the sermon, and to expose the futility of the objections, which had been mentioned to me.

Before I had preached my sermon, and after I had both preached and published it, I thought the duty, which it was designed to inculcate, to be one of very great importance, and the arguments adduced in support of it to have proved it to be even an indispensable one; and nothing, that I have heard or seen since, hath in the least altered my opinion of either. Some of you may suspect that I viewed them at first through a false medium, and still continue to do so. Were not my opinion, in this affair, supported by that of the most competent judges both in and out of the Assembly, that suspicion might be well founded; but having this fact to produce,

duce, I hope that my judgment will not be thought to be entirely blinded by the influence of self-partiality.

I suppose that, by this time, most if not all of you have seen Mr. Lamport's Sermons on preaching Christ crucified, a part of which was delivered on the Assembly-day next after that, on which I was called upon to preach before you. Several with myself, who were as attentive as the rest of his audience, did not understand a great deal of his sermon; and since it hath been revised and enlarged, it is not rendered to myself and many others a jot more intelligible.

I am sorry to see in the title-page of these sermons the words, "Published at the Request of *the* Assembly," as they may lead the public to think, that the *whole* of that body concurred in such a request. The author mistook the fact. To my certain knowledge several, though they did not choose to put a negative on the motion for requesting Mr. L. to publish, did not signify their approbation of it, and would have been glad, if it had been recalled. I mention this circumstance merely to prevent the world from supposing that *all* of us, *without exception*, took under our patronage what several of us did not understand. If Mr. L's readers should now find clearness and consistency of ideas, perspicuity of expression, and regularity of method, where several of us were unfortunate enough not to be able to discover them, they will pity our dulness, and applaud us for not adopting a measure, which might have deprived them of the pleasure and edification which they have received: or, though, on the contrary, their opinion of his performance should coincide with ours, we may hope to escape their censure, notwithstanding we did not take the step which might possibly have saved them the money, time, and trouble, employed in the purchase and perusal of these sermons; as we may fairly presume, that their candour will ascribe our conduct to motives, which, were they known, would deserve
praise

praise instead of blame. With respect to the ideas which such readers, as are not blessed with greater penetration than some of Mr. L's brethren, may entertain of the judgment of those who desired him to publish, they alone are immediately concerned in that matter.

The next words in the title page are a quotation from Cowper, the sentiment of which Mr. L. must be supposed to approve. The first part of it is, "In doctrine uncorrupt, in language plain, and plain in manner." Truly excellent! But what business have these words before his sermons? If you will listen to him, can you be uncorrupt or corrupt in doctrine? He bids you, p. 55, "away with all those speculations, which—have been proved to answer scarcely any other purpose than that of promoting differences among christians." Now as all the doctrines, as they have been called, of christianity have been speculated upon, and occasioned controversies and differences, you must of course throw them all by, and then you may ask him, how you can be uncorrupt or corrupt in doctrine, when you have nothing to do with any doctrine. If he tell you (as, no doubt, he will) that you may retain that comprehensive one, which, according to his representation, contains the whole subject of your commission, p. 24, and to which he would have you to confine your preaching, p. 50, he will be peculiarly unfortunate in his selection, since there can scarcely be found one, that hath been more the subject of disputation, and of disputation carried on with a very unchristian temper. But if, for that reason, you must also give up the favourite of your adviser, what alternative will you have left, but to speak on no doctrine at all; and then how you are to be uncorrupt in teaching any doctrine, let him inform you, if he can.

"In language plain, and plain in manner." One would imagine, as Mr. L. hath chosen for his text a passage,

containing the only subject, which you are allowed to handle in the pulpit, that he employed his utmost care to be plain in his language and manner, and so to give you at once a specimen of the matter, manner, and language, proper for public discourses. Whether you will take his specimen for your pattern, you will determine for yourselves: what is the judgment of the world about its plainness, time must discover. My sentiments on this head, and those of many others, have been already mentioned.

In the front of Mr. L's sermons stand two mutilated verses. The part quoted from the latter of them, being descriptive of Paul's manner of preaching the *gospel*, one would suppose, that, as our author hath tacked it on to the part quoted from the former, he means by *preaching Christ crucified* the same thing as *preaching the gospel*; but whether this be his meaning or not, I must leave others of more discernment than myself to find out. After having read more than once what looks as if it were intended to be an illustration of his text in the first six pages of his pamphlet, I remain incapable of discovering his ideas. However, if *to preach Christ crucified* be with him the same thing as *to preach the gospel*, to the doctrines and duties of which, considered in their full extent, I can have no objection, that sermons should be confined, I am totally at a loss to comprehend, how we are to perform this important branch of our ministerial duty, without paying regard to any system whatever. p. 57. Are sermons to be composed of *nothing* but phrases of scripture, without any explanations? If so, instead of preaching by no system, we shall be thought to preach by all systems. The Athanasian, Arian, Socinian, Calvinist, Arminian, Antinomian, Papist, Protestant, and every other, will in his turn suppose us to favour his particular tenets; for we know, that all christians alike pretend to fetch their respective systems from the bible. If we be allowed to introduce

produce only those parts of that best of books, which nosect hath drawn into its service, we must have nothing to do with the doctrinal, and very little with the preceptive or historical parts of it: we must be particularly careful to omit all such as bear any relation to the subject, on which alone Mr. L. would permit us to address our audiences.

I believe no writer ever broached a grosser absurdity, or rather proposed a more palpable impossibility, than that of a christian minister's preaching without regard to any system whatever. And Mr. L. as if presently aware of having directed his brethren to a conduct, which they could not pursue, before he finishes the sentence, in which he prescribes that conduct, allows the occasional introduction of explanations of particular texts, *different* from the *traditionary* conceptions of christian hearers. p. 57. But I do not wonder at this striking inconsistency, as marks of great confusion of thought may be traced in various parts of his performance. In my copy of his sermons I made notes in the margin of almost every page as I went along, many of which clearly point out that confusion.

But not to swell my appendix with those notes, and the passages to which they refer, I must call your attention to something else of more consequence, at least to myself and some of my brethren. Mr. L. you know, is a member of our Assembly. He immediately succeeded me in preaching before that body. His subject and his manner of treating it, amidst all the obscurity of the latter, were perceived to be pointed at what I had delivered on the like immediately preceding occasion. Even the day before he preached it was said, that my sermon was to be answered the next. It is in my opinion quite fair and unexceptionable conduct in one minister, especially when called upon to address his *brethren*, to counteract the influence of a doctrine advanced by another, which he conceives to have a dangerous tendency. This being

being my opinion, I ought not to object, neither *do* I object against having what I have at any time advanced scrutinized with the utmost rigour, and, if possible, overthrown. But when the circumstances just mentioned are considered, it will be seen at once, that I must condemn as unbrotherly many allusions and insinuations, respecting a certain class of preachers, scattered up and down in Mr. L's sermons ; because the persons, who heard the substance of them, or now read them, and are acquainted with those circumstances, will probably apply them to me. And in what light I must appear with those of my brethren, to whom the following passages may be thought to allude, you may easily judge.

" Compared with preaching Christ crucified, as above suggested, In what light does the minute and deep laboured discussion of any one of those subjects of dispute which have divided the christian world appear ?" They hide their diminished heads." p. 22. From this passage the reader, calling to mind, that I had recommended an attention to all the doctrines of christianity in our preaching, may suspect that my opinion is, that we should dwell *chiefly* upon controverted subjects, and handle them in an abstruse manner, and that such is my usual practice. The reader may be led by the following passage to entertain the same suspicion.

" The christian herald therefore most sadly mistakes the nature of his office, the design of the pulpit, and the business of the sabbath-day ; when he attempts to carry his hearers into the aerial regions of systematic divinity." p. 28.—

What is likely to be the reflection of the reader on perusing the following passage, but that myself and others, who think it to be a duty to lay before our audiences whatever we conceive the sacred records of our religion to teach as matter of faith and practice, aim at drawing off their attention from the one thing needful, and at fixing it on subjects of no importance, by the use of arts that disfigure or conceal the attractive

tractive form of religion? "It (indifference to religion)
 "arises, so far as preaching is concerned, from attempting
 "to convert sinners from the errors of their ways, by preach-
 "ing the gospel with wisdom of words, or man's wisdom—
 "when, for instance, the preacher is drawing off the atten-
 "tion of the people from the one thing needful, by a pom-
 "pous display of his oratorical powers and talents at com-
 "position; hereby disfiguring or concealing the attractive
 "form of true religion, by a glittering glare of words, and
 "an artificial dress," &c. p. 30. When the reader comes
 to p. 34, he may imagine, that it is the custom of myself
 and others to introduce scholastic subtleties, metaphysical
 refinements, and long chains of abstract reasoning, into our
 compositions. He may rank us in the number of those, who
 do not attend to the solemn warning of the Apostle, or his
 directions to Timothy and Titus, when he is perusing p.
 43, &c. And what will be his ideas of our conduct, when
 he reads p. 56 and 57, but that we value our talents, our
 pride, our popularity, more than the public utility, and that
 we preach Christ out of envy, or strife, or vain glory?—
 These allusions and insinuations I should have passed by
 without the least animadversion, had not Mr. L's
 hearers and readers been likely to make the particular appli-
 cation of them above mentioned, from the circumstances of
 the place where, and of the time and occasion on which he
 preached—of the connection in which he stands with the
 assembly—of the report concerning the *purpose* of his sermon,
 which got abroad *before* his delivery of it—and of the opi-
 nion which *now* prevails, and seems to be *countenanced* by
 the public notice, which he hath taken of my sermon, that
 his design was to *answer* it.

This notice is to be found in a long note beginning at
 p. 24. There having given us his ideas of the meaning of
 Paul's words prefixed to my sermon, he quotes a passage
 from

from it, p. 26, and in the same paragraph, a few lines after the quotation, says, "Permit me to ask whether there has
 " not been too much curiosity in every age, either like the
 " Papist, with the Jew, *to require a sign*, or, like the philoso-
 " phic Protestant, with the Greek, *to seek after wisdom*?
 " Preaching Christ crucified would do both of them more
 " service." Now I would ask any impartial person, whether from the close connection, in which this remark stands with the quotation from my sermon, the reader be not naturally led to apply the character of a philosophic protestant, who seeks after wisdom, to me, and to imagine that I do not preach Christ crucified.

The words immediately following, which begin a new paragraph, are, "The interpretation given of the above
 " phrase (counsel of God) will not, I am persuaded, be cor-
 " dially relished either by itinerant ignorance, or stationed
 " quacks in divinity; because it may tend to deprive their
 " sermons of all their supposed excellence." p. 27. Had Mr. L. closed his note here, every reader, who knew that for some years I was not fixed in any congregation, but occasionally preached at different places in my neighbourhood, where my assistance was wanted, and that I am now stationed in Exeter, would have concluded, that he designed to compliment me with the character of an ignorant itinerant, as descriptive of what I was in my former employment, and of a stationed quack in divinity, as descriptive of what I now am in my present: Such, I say, would have been his conclusion, had Mr. L. proceeded no farther. For the reader would hardly have thought, that I should adopt Mr. L.'s interpretation of my text, and rejected my own, which he would have naturally supposed to have been the result of examination, and of a careful attention to the expositions of commentators, without seeing very forcible reasons for so doing. He would rather have expected to see
 me

me step forth in support of an interpretation, necessary to be established in order to preserve the appearance of some connection between the subject and text of my sermon. And had such been his expectation, he must have perceived, that, in Mr. L's opinion, I deserved to be honoured with those elegant titles, which, it seems, belong to all, who reject his interpretation. Neither do I see how the reader is to be convinced by what follows, that Mr. L. did not suppose that I should merit those titles. For he proceeds thus: "yet I am equally persuaded, that it (the foregoing interpretation) will be *perused* with all candour by my much respected friend the author of the sermon alluded to." Now the reader observing nothing more to be expressed in these words than a strong persuasion, that I should *peruse* the proposed interpretation with all candour, not that I should *cordially relish* it, will infer, that Mr. L. did not *really expect* that I should do so, and that, therefore, I must deserve, in his opinion, to be ranked, after all, with the respectable fraternity of ignorant itinerants and stationed quacks in divinity. However, I shall show you by and by, that I am in very good company, in which you will think with me, that Mr. L. himself would have no reason to be ashamed of appearing.†

But permit me first to try whether I can explore the meaning of his interpretation. He says, that the whole counsel of God signifies the whole determination of God concerning their (men's) holiness and happiness. p. 23, 24. I cast my eye upon the note below, and there I am told, that βελη signifies *advice given for the regulation of conduct*. These words, then, I take to be explanatory of what Mr. L. means by *determination*, the word by which he translates βελη. Not to dwell on the circumstance of a new signification being put on the word *determination*, I ask, to the regulation of what conduct does this advice refer? to that, which

we are to follow towards one another *only*? or to that *also* which we should pursue with respect to God? I would hope, that this latter is not to be excluded. But if it be not, I presume, that the advice in question relates to the homage and worship, which we are to pay to the Deity, together with the ideas of his nature, character, and government, and the affections towards him, from which that homage and worship ought to flow. And, if this be the case, we must be unfortunately entangled with systems, (a thing, against which Mr. L. so earnestly cautions us) if we will take the apostle for our guide, and declare the whole advice given by God for the regulation of conduct. It appears to me, therefore, that the meaning put upon the word $\beta\epsilon\lambda\eta$ by Mr. L. himself, if I understand it, serves to confirm the propriety of that part of the conduct, inculcated on christian ministers in my sermon, which he bids you carefully to avoid.

Let us proceed with Mr. L. He says, p. 24, note, "*The* various passages where the word ($\beta\epsilon\lambda\eta$) is used in the "N. T. prove this," i. e. his meaning to be the just one. I dare say, that you concluded, upon reading these words, that in the quotations following he had produced *every* place in the N. T. where $\beta\epsilon\lambda\eta$ is used, unless you at once recollected others, where it may be found, or consulted your concordances to see, whether it occurred elsewhere. Whatever was your conclusion, that was mine, before I had recourse to Schmidt, who referred me to several other places, among which there is one much to my purpose. It is Acts v. 38, where Gamaliel evidently makes use of $\beta\epsilon\lambda\eta$ to denote the doctrine taught by the apostles. These men had been miraculously delivered from prison by an angel, who had commanded them to go and speak in the temple to the people *all* the words of this life. ver. 20. When they were in the act of executing his order, ver. 25, the captain with
the

the officers went and brought them before the Sanhedrim, where they were charged with filling Jerusalem with their *doctrine*. Peter and the apostles made their defence. ver. 29. Those, who heard them, were cut to the heart, and took counsel to slay them. ver. 33. Gamaliel checked their rage by suggesting to them various considerations, of which one was: If this *counsel* or this work be of men, it will come to naught. ver. 38. What can *counsel* (βελη) mean in this connection, but the *doctrine*, with which the apostles had been filling Jerusalem, and ceased not, upon being set at liberty, to preach daily in the temple and from house to house, teaching Jesus Christ, i. e. his religion? Dr. Doddridge paraphrases the words of Gamaliel thus: "If it be merely a human contrivance and deceit which we are not capable of proving it is, it will soon sink and come to nothing of itself; some incident will arise to discredit it, and the whole interest of this Jesus will moulder away." Beza and Grotius appear also to understand by βελη the christian doctrine. The former interprets ἐξ ἀνθρώπων by ex humano commento, and the latter by fictum & commentitium, quod, says he, apparet ex antithesi, ut Matt. xxi. 25, where Jesus asks the chief priests and elders whether the baptism of John be from heaven or of men. What could these writers understand by βελη but the christian doctrine, or something which included it, which was not a human contrivance, ex humano commento, &c? So I find others besides myself apprehend βελη Luke vii. 30. to mean not only the *design* of God, but the *means* by which it was to be effected, viz. the *teaching* of John, which was rejected by the Pharisees. Vid. Commentators.

But it is time for me to proceed. Mr. L. asserts, that βελην Acts xx. 27. "does not in the least refer to the communication of truth simply considered in itself." p. 24. What he means by the words *simply considered in itself*, I will

not pretend to determine. If βελην refer *at all* to the communication of *truth*, I conceive it must refer to the communication of *christian truth*, and that the addition of *πασαν* forces us to suppose, that it refers to the communication of *all christian truth*. This conclusion, though I do not see how Mr. L. can evade it, if he allow βελην to refer *at all* to the communication of truth, he is not disposed to admit. He attempts to set aside such a conclusion, by reasoning from the situation and circumstances of the apostle at the time of his interview with the elders of the Ephesian church. This reasoning (for such, I suppose, he would have us to consider it) I do not understand; if I did, I certainly would not pass it by without examination.

Let us attend a little to the connection of this verse. In the speech of the apostle to the elders he tells them, that he had kept back nothing that was profitable; it should have been translated, nothing of the profitable things, ver. 20.†—
that

† ΟΥΔΕΝ ΥΠΕΡΕΙΛΑΜΗΝ ΤΩΝ ΣΥΜΦΕΡΟΝΤΩΝ. Whether υμιν be added to these words according to some readings, or not, is immaterial. I find commentators to differ very little about the meaning of *υπερειλαμην*, and I do not see that Mr. L. objects to our translation of that word. p. 25, note. But he supposes the Apostle to intimate in this passage, that *some* things revealed to him were not profitable to Jew or Greek. I humbly conceive, that the words of the apostle do not justify such a supposition. A literal translation of them is, I have kept back nothing of the profitable things; in which words he does not appear to divide the things revealed to him into profitable and unprofitable, but, representing *all* of them as profitable not to himself only but also to others, to assert that he had not concealed *any one* of them. It is a strange idea, that the apostle should have been possessed of any information relating to christianity, which it was not fit that he should at any time impart to *some* of his converts; and it must be a peculiarly strange one, that he should have any such information, which it was improper for him to communicate to elders, *whom he was to see no more*, and
whom

that he had testified to Jews and Greeks repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ, ver. 21.—that he was determined still to pursue the same honest conduct, and to testify *the* gospel of the grace of God, not a *part* of the gospel withholding the *rest*, ver. 24.—and that they, (the elders) among whom he had gone preaching the kingdom of God, would see his face no more, ver. 25. Desiring you to remark here, that, from the connection, *repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, the gospel of the grace of God, and the kingdom of God*, appear to be used as expressions of the same general import, I observe, that the apostle, immediately upon mentioning, that he had preached to them the kingdom of God, and that they would see his face no more, proceeds to call them to record, that he was free from the blood of all, assigning as a proof, that he had not shunned to declare unto them all the counsel of God. Now what can all the counsel of God here signify but the whole doctrine of the kingdom of God, which he had immediately before told them he had preached among them, or, according to the other phrases he had before employed in his speech to them to denote the same thing, the whole doctrine of repentance towards God and of faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ, or the whole gospel of the grace of God? This farther appears from what follows. For upon the circumstance of having declared to them the whole counsel of God, so that they were fully instructed in the
christian

whom he charged to be watchful guardians of the purity of the christian faith. But if even so strange an idea as this latter should be entertained by some, surely no one can imagine that the apostle, in any of his *writings*, which he could not but foresee would fall into *all sorts of hands*, revealed those secrets, with which he durst not intrust these *elders*. And if these secrets be not now to be found in the sacred writings, my position, which hath to do only with what is *therein revealed*, cannot be affected by the text considered in this note, whatever sense be put upon it.

christian doctrine, he founds his solemn charge to them to take heed to themselves and to all the flock, and inforces the charge by a prediction, that there would arise among them men, who would speak perverse things (things contrary to sound doctrine. Doddridge) which they were qualified to refute by the plenary information which he had given them. It may tend to confirm you in the opinion, that I am right in my ideas of the apostle's meaning, to see in what company I stand. Hammond in Syn. Critic. thus observes upon the passage: "Christianam doctrinam *universam*, quâ vos ad-
 " versus hæreses futuras præmunirem." Grotius remarks: "*Voluntatis nomine μελωρημικως* hîc significat (scil. aposto-
 " lus) *omne* id quod à singulis præstari vult Deus ut ad sa-
 " lutem perveniatur." In the præstanda, no doubt, Grotius includes as well the things to be *believed*, as the things to be *done*, as he could not be ignorant, that *faith* is required of a christian as well as works. Wolfius in his *Curæ Philol.* says: Significat scilicet, Paulum nequaquam perfide aut do-
 " lose Christi negotium egisse, sed bonâ fide, maximeque
 " serio, ita ut nihil illi prius fuerit, quam ut Apostoli officio
 " in regno Christi promovendo sincere fungeretur." The use of such strong expressions concerning the manner, in which Paul discharged the office of an apostle, cannot be reconciled with the supposition, that the author had any idea of his having kept back any part of the revelation, which he had received and *could* communicate. Dr. Doddridge's paraphrase is: "For God is my witness, that I have sincerely
 " laboured for the salvation of all that heard me, and have
 " not declined to declare to you with the utmost freedom
 " and integrity all the counsel of God; but on the contrary
 " have laid before you *the whole system of divine truths*, re-
 " lating to our redemption by Christ, and the way to eternal
 " happiness with him, in the most plain and faithful manner,
 " whatever censure, contempt, or opposition, I might incur
 by

“ by such a declaration.” He says in a note, that “ Mr. Brekel hath proved by quotations from Demosthenes and Lucian, that the proper import of *υποστέλλω* in such a connection, is to *disguise* any important truth, or at least to *decline* the open publication of it, for fear of displeasing those to whom it ought to be declared.” See also Dr. Benson’s paraphrase of the whole speech in his Hist. of the First Planting of Christianity. Dr. Whitby interprets all the counsel of God by “ *the whole christian doctrine* ;” and in his note observes, “ Hence we learn that it is necessary for a pastor to declare to his people all that is necessary for them to *believe* and do, in order to salvation, that the guilt of their ruin may not lie upon him.” Though I may differ from Mr. Leechman in some religious points, yet I cannot forbear quoting a passage from his excellent sermon on I Tim. iv. 16, that you may also see his opinion on the subject under consideration.” Now it must be acknowledged, *says he*, that it is an indispensable part of our duty as teachers of the religion of Jesus, to declare these and *all the other* truths discovered to us by revelation. We cannot justify ourselves as having declared the whole counsel of God (observe how he understood this phrase) if we overlook *any* of them, neglect to *teach* them, or treat them only in a *transient and superficial* manner.” p. 27. Ed. 3d, Glasgow, 1742. The same were the ideas of Mr. Lowthion, whose masterly discourse on the reasonableness of ministers speaking freely, published in 1758, and preached at Kendal 26 Aug. 1756, well deserves our attention. There you will find the objections to such a conduct most satisfactorily answered.

It must be evident to all, who read Mr. L’s sermons with understanding and attention, that he hath made no attack upon that part of my reasoning, which is founded on general principles, but laboured by a critique to overthrow my position

tion so far only, as it rests on the words of the apostle prefixed to my sermon. Even in that attempt, I think, by this time he must appear to have failed. I, therefore, consider myself as having still a firm standing on the authority of the apostle, and on principles the most clear and incontrovertible. If Mr. L. or any other gentleman among you be of a different opinion, and choose to step forward as my antagonist, I have no reluctance to meet him. But I beg leave to inform any person, who may feel himself thus inclined, to observe, that I do not look upon myself as bound to take notice of any thing but pure *reasoning* on the *single* subject to be discussed, or to do even *so much*, till a reply be given to *every* argument, which I have already advanced.

You must allow me, Gentlemen, before I conclude, to express my wonder at seeing published in these days by *request of protestant dissenting ministers* sermons, which carry the *appearance* of being intended to prevent the good effects of free enquiry, to deter ministers from attempting to elucidate the doctrines of christianity in their discourses, and to countenance the use of phrases relating to a subject, well known to be one of the most controverted in the whole compass of theology, without explanations. Surely, Gentlemen, none of you can entertain a serious apprehension, that any genuine christian truth can suffer from the strictest scrutiny. Surely none of you can suppose, that their religion hath its *esoteric* doctrines, an acquaintance with which is to be confined to themselves and other initiated persons, and *exoteric* ones designed for general use, which, therefore, they may safely impart to the vulgar. Could this be the opinion of any among you, it would behove them to reflect, that the laity are not aware of such a distinction, and that, many of them being of too curious and prying a turn to be easily kept hoodwinked, there seems to be but one way left of escaping the charge or suspicion of temporising, and that is, to aid them

them in their researches by a fair, candid, and undisguised representation of what is conceived to be the truth and the *whole* truth as it is in Jesus. Once more: Surely none of you can feel any reluctance to comply with the advice of Mr. L. and "to sacrifice your love of popularity on the altar of public utility," by not using without explanation ambiguous phrases, either to preserve a reputation for orthodoxy, or to fascinate the ears of people with words, to which they affix either no determinate ideas, or ideas different from those of the preacher.

I must trespass a moment longer on your patience. Some of my friends suppose, that, in the use of the term *quacks in divinity*, Mr. L. alludes to the circumstance of my not having been ordained. A paper on the subject of presbyterian ordination, as now managed, will perhaps ere long appear in a periodical work, when Mr. L. or any other gentleman among you may have an opportunity of vindicating the present practice, which is objected to by others besides myself as countenancing superstition. In the mean time, if by *a quack in divinity* nothing more be signified than *an unordained minister*, I am not ashamed to wear that title. Wishing you to be successful promoters of truth and righteousness, I remain,

GENTLEMEN,

Your sincere friend,

J. BRETLAND.

P. S. Soon after I had finished this appendix, I had an opportunity of reading the sermons, lately published by the truly great and worthy Dr. Price. The opinion and conduct of a person, so justly celebrated for his eminent abilities, knowledge, and integrity, challenge regard, how little attention soever may be thought due to what so obscure a

D

person

person as I am may at any time advance. I am fully sensible, that the authorities of the most distinguished characters ought no farther to influence our practice, than they appear to quadrate with the dictates of sound reason and the directions of scripture. But when we observe such a man as Dr. Price to have laid before his congregation, without the least equivocation or reserve, his ideas of the gospel, even on the most controverted subjects, we must *presume*, that he hath acted in this manner in consequence of the most mature consideration of the nature of his duty, and, therefore, feel ourselves prompted to examine, whether we ought to *go and do likewise*. The following passage from the beginning of his 5th sermon will plainly shew you what his ideas are of the duty of a christian minister. " I have
 " thought it, *says he*, a proper part of the duty of my office
 " in this place, to give you a *particular* account of my ideas
 " of that gospel which we all profess, and on which we build
 " our hopes of a future happy immortality."